

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA**

<b>MICHAEL MCLAUGHLIN</b> <i>Petitioner, pro se</i>	:	<b>CIVIL ACTION</b>
	:	
	:	<b>NO. 20-1156</b>
<b>v.</b>	:	
	:	
<b>PENNSYLVANIA FIRST JUDICIAL DISTRICT (PROBATION), et al.</b> <i>Defendants</i>	:	
	:	

**ORDER**

**AND NOW**, this 19<sup>th</sup> day of April 2022, upon consideration of the petition for a writ of *habeas corpus* filed pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2254 by Petitioner Michael McLaughlin, proceeding *pro se*, [ECF 2], and Respondents’ response in opposition to the petition, [ECF 14], and after a careful review of the Report and Recommendation submitted by United States Magistrate Judge Elizabeth T. Hey, [ECF 15], to which no objections were filed,<sup>1</sup> it is hereby **ORDERED** that:

1. The Report and Recommendation is **APPROVED** and **ADOPTED**.
2. The petition for a writ for *habeas corpus* is **DISMISSED**, as moot.
3. There is no basis for the issuance of a certificate of appealability.
4. The Clerk of Court is directed to mark this matter **CLOSED**.

**BY THE COURT:**

/s/ Nitza I. Quiñones Alejandro

**NITZA I. QUIÑONES ALEJANDRO**

*Judge, United States District Court*

---

<sup>1</sup> Petitioner was granted an extension to file objections, if any, by April 6, 2022. [ECF 17]. As of the date of this Order, Petitioner has not filed any objections, and the time to do so has expired. In the absence of any objections, the Report and Recommendation (“R&R”) is reviewed under the “plain error” standard. *See Facyson v. Barnhart*, 2003 WL 22436274, at \*2 (E.D. Pa. May 30, 2003). Under this plain error standard of review, an R&R should only be rejected if the magistrate judge commits an error that was “(1) clear or obvious, (2) affect[ed] ‘substantial rights,’ and (3) seriously affected the fairness, integrity or public reputation of judicial proceedings.” *Leyva v. Williams*, 504 F.3d 357, 363 (3d Cir. 2007) (internal quotations and citations omitted). Here, after a thorough, independent review of the record and the R&R, this Court finds no error was committed by the Magistrate Judge and, therefore, approves and adopts the R&R in its entirety.